DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 588 CG 007 482

AUTHOR	Silverman, Manuel S.; Quinn, Philip F.
TITLE	Monitor-Modeling Supervision in Practicum.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	13p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Behavioral Science Research; Counseling; *Counseling Effectiveness; *Counselor Performance; Counselors; *Counselor Training; Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; Helping Relationship; Individual Counseling; *Practicums; Professional Education; Training

ABSTRACT

Twenty-four practicum trainees experienced either monitor-modeling or immediate feedback supervision during their training. Ten minute counseling sessions with coached clients were taped before and after the practicum. Three independent judges rated the tapes, using Carkhuff's scales for "gross ratings of facilitative interpersonal functioning" to assess (1) the level of facilitative conditions offered by the trainee, and (2) the trainee's action orientation (Carkhuff, 1969). Results indicated that both groups were similar at the beginning of the experiment; that the judges' ratings increased significantly from pre-test to post-test for both groups; that, although there were indications that the monitor-modeling supervision was more effective, there were no significant differences between the two groups on the post-test; and, finally, that the amount of growth from pre-test to post-test was significantly greater for the monitor-modeling group. The investigators strongly suggest further, more extensive evaluations of monitor-modeling supervision to more fully assess its usefulness. (Author)

ED 067588

MONITOR-MODELING SUPERVISION IN PRACTICUM

Manuel S. Silverman[1]

Loyola University

and

Philip F. Quinn, S. J.

St. Joseph's Hospital

Tampa, Florida

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The procedure of having an experienced counselor present with the trainee during actual interviews is a method of practicum supervision that has received little attention. Dreikurs (1950), Lott (1952, 1957), and Mallers (1968) have all explored the value and efficiency of such a system of training. This experiment compared the effectiveness of a particular application of this approach to supervision to the effectiveness of what might be considered a more "standard" approach.

Monitor-modeling supervision. This supervisory technique placed the supervisor in the room with the trainee during counseling interviews. The trainee took the initiative for the sesions. The supervisor interceded from time to time with a more accurate response when he perceived that the trainee had missed the communication from the client or was pursuing a tangential point. The supervisor's response "monitored" or regulated the sessions, as well as providing a "model" type of communicati on. The value of similar types of procedures in counselor education have been previously reported (Jakubowski-Spector, Dustin, and George, 1971; Hargrove and Porter, 1971).

Immediate-feedback supervision. In this situation, the trainees had

CG 007 482

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

their tapes listened to immediately following their counseling sessions. During the 45 minutes of supervision, the supervisor would play segments of the tape, offer comments and suggestions, and ask several questions of the trainee. This procedure was based on the idea that in "going over the tape" the trainee would gain insights into his counseling techniques and, aided by the remarks of the supervisor, could affect a more efficient counseling relationship.

This study examined the facilitative skills of the trainees in relation to their differential exposure to these two methods of supervision.

Hypotheses. The following specific null hypotheses were tested:

1. There are no significant differences between the pre-test judges' ratings for the monitor-modeling group and the immediate-feedback group.

2. There are no significant differences between pre-test and post-test judges' ratings for the monitor-modeling group.

3. There are no significant differences between pre-test and post-test judges' ratings for the immediate-feedback group.

4. There are no significant differences between post-test judges' ratings for the two groups.

5. There are no significant differences between the pre-test to post-test change in judges' ratings for the two groups.

Method

Sample. The trainees consisted of the 24 students enrolled in the introductory practicum in Guidance and Counseling at Loyola University, second semester, 1970-71. They were divided into two groups of 12 on the basis of age, sex, occupation, and counseling experience. The most typical trainee in this study was an unmarried female in her late twenties.

She had about six to eight years of teaching experience, no counseling experience, and was working toward a master's degree in guidance and counseling.

The clients seen for purposes of the analyses of this study were drama students trained to serve as coached clients, all presenting the same problem.

Three supervisors participated in the study. Two were doctoral candidates and the third had the doctorate, all in counselor education. All three had previous experience in practicum supervision. ~~Previous~~ PRIOR to this effort, the experimental procedures of the project were initiated on a trial basis in a previous practicum. The supervisors were therefore quite familiar with the procedures.[2]

Instrument. The form for "Gross ratings of facilitative interpersonal functioning" (Carkhuff, 1969) was used to establish the level of facilitation and action orientation of the trainees in their pre and post-practicum interviews with coached clients.

Procedures. Each trainee taped a ten minute session with one of the coached clients prior to the first class meeting of the practicum. Following this, 12 trainees were exposed to monitor-modeling supervision, and 12 trainees were exposed to immediate-feedback supervision. Each trainee had four supervisory sessions during the practicum. With the exception of the differential supervision for those four sessions, practicum experiences for all 24 trainees were similar in content and process. At the end of the course, each trainee again taped a ten minute session with one of the coached clients.

All tapes were then rated by the three independent judges, using

Carkhuff's scale. The judges indicated global ratings from 1 (worst) to 5 (best) for the ten minute sessions. The judges, two women and one man, all possessed doctorates in guidance and counseling and had at least two years experience in practicum supervision. Each judge evaluated 16 anonymous tapes. Prior to the evaluation of the tapes, the udges participated in two training sessions in evaluative procedures. A z test (Freund and Williams, 1964) was used to establish the extent of inner consistency between the three judges and expert ratings. The z scores for the judges indicated a high degree of inner consistency (z = .38, .37, & .03; .05 level = $\pm$1.97). Mean judges' ratings were 2.40, 2.43, and 2.30. The mean expert rating was 2.31.

Upon completion of data collection, t tests were computed to measure differences between mean scores for the two groups (Winer, 1962).

Results

Initially, all trainees interviewed one of three coached clients. No significant differences were found between the two groups on these pre-test ratings. The results are summarized in Table 1.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

In the comparison of the monitor-modeling group from pre to post-practicum on judges' ratings, the ratings indicated a significant improvement. These results are summarized in Table 2.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The immediate-feedback group also improved significantly during the practicum, although the absolute change was not nearly so great as that of the monitor-modeling group. The results are summarized in Table 3.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 3 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 4 summarizes the results of the post-test comparisons between the two groups. On the post-test, both groups were approaching minimal levels of facilitation, with the monitor-modeling group somewhat more facilitative. The difference, while favoring the monitor-modeling group, was not significant.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 4 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The final analysis, examining differences between the two groups on pre to post changes in judges' ratings is summarized in Table 5. This analysis revealed that the monitor-modeling group showed a significantly greater amount of improvement over the four month period.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 5 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Discussion

The results indicated that both the monitor-modeling and immediate-feedback forms of supervision resulted in significant growth in skills. Although the trainees grew in facilitative skills regardless of the particular form of supervision, the significantly greater amount of growth by

the monitor-modeling trainees indicates that it was a more efficient form of supervision. One explanation of the tendency of the results to support the monitor-modeling concerns the nature of the supervisory relationship. The trainees in the immediate-feedback groups experienced a student-teacher relationship during their supervision. The trainees in the monitor-modeling group experienced a closer relationship with their supervisors. The trainees and the supervisors worked as teams with individual clients, and the supervison was a collaborative effort. The investigators believe that the development of this collaborative environment in the monitor-modeling situation contributed to the comparatively greater growth in skills.

Another significant factor in the explanation of the monitor-modeling rate of growth was that of immediacy. Stray responses, inaccurate trainee responses, confusion about what the client was conveying were responded to immediately, during the actual session. The trainees possibly learned to respond more accurately to their clients through the intervening responses of the supervisor. Supervisor presence was also a factor during the five to ten minutes of discussion following each monitor-modeling session. During this discussion, the supervisor could make more accurate observations about the sessions, since he himself had been present.

While there is possibly no one answer regarding the best method of supervision for all practicum situations, monitor-modeling, under the conditions of this study, has demonstrated value as a mode of practicum supervision. Since the number of trainees in this study was small, and the situation a local one, the investigators strongly suggest further, more extensive evaluations to more fully assess the value of monitor-modeling supervision.

References

Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and Human Relations. Vol. 1. Selection and Training. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.

Dreikurs, R. Techniques and dynamics of multiple psychotherapy. Psychiatric Quarterly, 1950, 24, 788-799.

Freund, J. E., & Williams, F. J. Elementary Business Statistics: A Modern Approach. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964, p. 267.

Hargrove, D. S. & Porter, T. L. Discrimination: an aspect of the helping process. Journal of Research and Development in Education. 1971, 4, 26-34.

Jakubowski-Spector, P., Dustin, R., & George, R. L. Toward developing a behavioral counselor education model. Counselor Education and Supervision. 1971, 10, 242-250.

Lott, G. M. The training on non-medical cooperative psychotherapists by multiple psychotherapy. American Journal of Psychotherapy. 1952, 6, 440-448.

Lott, G. M. Multiple psychotherapy: efficient use of psychiatric treatment and training time. Psychiatric Quarterly Supplement. 1957, 31, 276-293.

Mallers, P. B. Team counseling in counselor education. Personnel and Guidance Journal. 1968, 46, 981-983.

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962, pp. 24-45.

Footnotes

1. Requests for reprints should be sent to Manuel S. Silverman, Department of Guidance and Counseling, Loyola University, 820 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

2. Due to lack of funds and additional faculty, the investigators, in their normal faculty role, served as two of the three supervisors. This situation was unavoidable, and an extremely conscious effort was made to provide unbiased supervision to all trainees.

TABLE 1

Pre-practicum Judges' ratings of

Monitor-modeling Group and Immediate-feedback Group

Source	$\bar{X}$ Ratings	S.D.	Difference	df	t
MM-pre	1.50	.54	.28	22	.81*
IF-pre	1.79	.09			

*p < .46

TABLE 2

Comparison of Pre and Post-practice

Judges' Ratings for Monitor-modeling Group

Source	$\bar{X}$ Ratings	SD	Difference	df	t
MM-pre	1.50	.54	1.17	22	6.82**
MM-post	2.68	.98			

** $p < .01$

TABLE 3

Comparison of Pre and Post-practicum

Judges' Ratings for Immediate-feedback Group

Source	$\bar{X}$ Ratings	SD	Difference	df	t
IF-pre	1.79	.09	.38	22	6.56**
IF-post	2.18	.67			

** $p < .01$

TABLE 4

Post-practicum Judges' Ratings of

Monitor-modeling Group and Immediate-feedback Group

Source	$\bar{X}$ Ratings	SD	Difference	df	t
MM-post	2.68	.98	.50	22	1.46*
IF-post	2.18	.67			

*p < .16

TABLE 5

Comparison of Pre to Post-practicum Changes

between Monitor-modeling Group and Immediate-feedback Group

Source	$\bar{X}$ Change in Judges' Ratings	SD	Difference	df	t
MM	1.17	1.71	.79	22	6.30**
IF	.38	1.22			

**$p < .01$